

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the above-identified Office Action. The above listing of the claims supersedes any previous listing. Favorable reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Status

By this Amendment, Applicant has rewritten claim 2 to incorporate the limitations of claim 3 and has cancelled claim 3. The recitation "with the printing device being brought into contact with the dice" in claim 2 has been cancelled and therefore the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12 and 13 are now pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson (US 2003/0157762), hereinafter Peterson, in view of Inaba (JP 405226484A), hereinafter Inaba, is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 2

Claim 2, as amended, calls for "after said printing, removing defective ink marks" and "after removing the defective ink marks, curing the ink marks on the dice". In other words, claim 2 comprises a step of removing defective ink marks after the printing step and before the curing step.

This is not disclosed in Peterson or Inaba. Peterson discloses in paragraph [0038] that before curing the marking medium 120, the bond between the wafer 100 and the underlying contrast film 132 formed by the adhesive 136 is preferably weaker than the bond between the outer contrast film 134 and the transfer medium 150. As a result, the marking medium 120 may be tacked onto the wafer 100 and then removed if there are any wrinkles or air pockets between the marking medium 120 and the wafer 100. Furthermore, the marking medium 120 is cured before ink marks are formed on the dice. Therefore, the step of removing wrinkles or air pockets in Peterson is performed before both the printing step and curing step. Peterson clearly fails to teach or suggest the claimed step of removing "defective ink marks" after the printing step and before the curing step.

In addition, as known in the art, printing ink mark by transferring ink from a printing device onto a surface is achieved by bringing the printing device into contact with the surface. Peterson discloses a method for marking microelectronics devices by removing a layer of material on a surface of the die with a light energy, e.g. a laser. As known in the art, a laser printing device will NEVER be brought into physical contact with dice when the exposed backside surfaces of the dice are to be printed. Therefore, the claimed printing method is clearly different from that disclosed in Peterson.

Furthermore, Inaba also fails to disclose the claimed step of removing defective ink marks after the printing step and before the curing step.

Therefore, claim 2, as amended, is patentable over Peterson in view of Inaba in that taken individually and in combination are such as to fail to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter.

As to claim 3

Claim 3 is cancelled and the rejection of claim 3 is therefore rendered moot.

As to claims 12 and 13

Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 2 and are considered patentable at least for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 2.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

- 1) The rejection of claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Inaba, and further in view of Schramm(US 2004/0060910), hereinafter Schramm, is respectfully traversed.

As to claims 4-6

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 2 and are considered patentable at least for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 2.

- 2) The rejection of claims 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Inaba, and further in view of Grigg(US 6,703,105), hereinafter Schramm, is respectfully traversed.

As to claims 9-10

Claims 9-10 depend from claim 2 and are considered patentable at least for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 2.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and withdrawal of the above detailed rejections. Applicant submits that pending claims 2, 4-6, 9, 10, 12 and 13 are in condition for allowance and request a favorable action.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP



Benjamin A. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111 BJH/KT/klb
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: April 18, 2007